### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

# IN RE RC2 CORP. TOY LEAD PAINT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 07 C 7184

MDL No. 1893

JUDGE LEINENWEBER

PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF FIFTEEN PAGES

MDL Plaintiffs, for their Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Brief in Excess of Fifteen Pages, state as follows:

#### I. BACKGROUND

On January 28, 2008, Plaintiffs filed an Emergency Motion for a Preliminary Injunction Pursuant to the All Writs Act and an accompanying memorandum in support thereof (collectively the "Emergency Motion"). The memorandum was 24 pages in length and included a Declaration of Elizabeth A. Fegan with 32 attached exhibits.

On February 8, 2008, Defendants filed their Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for a Preliminary Injunction Pursuant to the All Writs Act ("Defendants' Opposition"). Defendants' Opposition is 34 pages in length and included Declarations from Bart T. Murphy and James L. Petersen, as well as 4 exhibits. By agreement, Defendants' Opposition thereby exceeded this Court's standard fifteen (15) page limit.

In response to Defendants' Opposition, Plaintiffs are preparing and intend to file a reply brief. Plaintiffs' reply brief is also anticipated to exceed the 15-page limit imposed by Local Rule 7.1. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1, Plaintiffs respectfully request leave to file an opposition brief in excess of 15 pages.

#### II. BASIS FOR RELIEF

Local Rule 7.1 provides that "[n]either a brief in support of or in opposition to any motion ... shall exceed 15 pages without prior approval of the court." Defendants' 34-page Opposition raises new arguments particularly under the *Colorado River* and the "Rooker-Feldman" doctrines. To effectively respond to Defendants' arguments, Plaintiffs' reply brief is anticipated to exceed the 15-page limit set forth in Local Rule 7.1, but is expected to be less than 30 pages. Defendants' counsel, Bart T. Murphy, does not object to the relief sought herein. Moreover, this Motion is brought in good faith for good cause and will not prejudice any party.

#### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons provided above, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court grant Plaintiffs leave to file a reply brief to Defendants' Opposition in excess of fifteen (15) pages.

Dated: February 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted

By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Fegan
Elizabeth A. Fegan
Timothy P. Mahoney
Daniel J. Kurowski
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

820 North Boulevard, Suite B

Oak Park, IL 60301

Telephone: (708) 776-5600 Facsimile: (708) 775-5601 E-mail: beth@hbsslaw.com E-mail: timm@hbsslaw.com E-mail: dank@hbsslaw.com

Steve W. Berman Ivy D. Arai HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: (206) 623-7292

Facsimile: (206) 623-0594 E-mail: steve@hbsslaw.com E-mail: ivy@hbsslaw.com Laurence D. King Linda M. Fong KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 555 Montgomery Street Suite 1501 San Francisco, CA 94111

Frederic S. Fox Donald R. Hall KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 805 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022

William N. Riley Joseph Williams Jamie Kendall PRICE WAICUKAUSKI & RILEY, LLC 301 Massachusetts Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46204

Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Class

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Elizabeth A. Fegan, an attorney, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF FIFTEEN PAGES was served on counsel via CM/ECF and counsel on the following Service List via e-mail on February 13, 2008:

Bart Thomas Murphy, Esq. ICE MILLER LLP 2300 Cabot Drive Suite 455 Lisle, IL 60532 Bart.murphy@icemiller.com

James Petersen, Esq.
Katherine A. Winchester, Esq.
Judy S. Okenfuss, Esq.
ICE MILLER LLP
One American Square
Suite 3100
Indianapolis, IN 46282-0200
James.peterson@icemiller.com
Katherine.winchester@icemiller.com
Judy.okenfuss@icemiller.com

Counsel for Defendants in MDL 1893 and Barrett

\_\_/s/ Elizabeth A. Fegan Elizabeth A. Fegan